arXiv:math/0412311v1 [math.OC] 15 Dec 2004

Finding Blackjack's Optimal Strategy in Real-time and Player's Expected Win

Jarek Solowiej

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We describe the probability theory behind a casino game, blackjack, and the procedure to compute the optimal strategy for a deck of arbitrary cards and player's expected win given that he follows the optimal strategy. The exact blackjack probabilities are used, in contrast to approximate probabilities used by Baldwin et al. [1] or Monte Carlo methods. We distinguish between two probability measures $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$; $\mathbb{P}$ is used to compute dealer's probabilities and $\mathbb{Q}$ is used to compute player's expectations. The implementation is described in pseudo-C++. The program is fast enough to deal with any blackjack's hand in a matter of seconds.

The main rules of blackjack are identical for all casinos, but they differ on details. And it would be too cumbersome to deal with all the variation of those. So this paper provides only the general framework, which, by the way, is easily adaptable to any particular set of blackjack's rules. The reader can see [1] for explanation of the rules.

We distinguish between hard and soft blackjack's hands; a hand with an ace counted as 11 is soft, otherwise we call it hard. For example, ace and five is a soft sixteen ($1+5=16s$); ten and six is a hard sixteen ($10+6=16h$); or ace and ace is a soft twelve ($1+1=12s$).

Dealer's Probabilities

During the first stage of a game, dealer gets two cards, one face up and one face down. We can assume that his face-down card is still in a deck. Let D_d denote dealer's total given that his face-up card is d (in this paper d always denotes dealer's face-up card), where $d=1$ means an ace (it can be counted as 1 or 11),

[1] jarek@math.albany.edu

$d = 2$ means a deuce, ..., and $d = 10$ means a ten or any face card (we don't distinguish between a ten and any face card and we refer to them as a ten).

The blackjack's rules force dealer to hit anything below 17, so dealer's total can be 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 (any combination of cards adding to 21 but ten and ace), a natural (ten and ace), and a bust (anything above 21). To simplify the notation we denote a natural by 22 and a bust by 23.

At this point let's assume that we know dealer's probabilities (see the appendix for the algorithm),

$$\mathbb{P}[D_d = k] \quad \text{for} \quad k = 17, \ldots, 22, \quad \text{and} \quad d = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, 10,$$

and $\mathbb{P}[D_d = 23] = 1 - \sum_{k=17}^{22} \mathbb{P}[D_d = k]$. We assume that there are enough cards in a deck so $\mathbb{P}[D_d = k] = 0$ for $k < 17$, and therefore the distribution, $\mathbb{P}[D_d = 17], \ldots, \mathbb{P}[D_d = 23]$, is not degenerate.

Since dealer checks for a natural (if $d = 1$ or $d = 10$) before player makes any decision we exclude this possibility by conditioning on the event $D_d \neq 22$. This provides us with a new probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ such that $\mathbb{Q}[D_d = 22] = 0$. By definition, given $d = 1, 2, \ldots, 10$,

$$\mathbb{Q}[D_d = k] = \mathbb{P}[D_d = k | D_d \neq 22] = \frac{\mathbb{P}[D_d = k]}{\mathbb{P}[D_d \neq 22]} \quad \text{for} \quad k = 17, \ldots, 21,$$

where the trivial case $\mathbb{P}[D_d \neq 22] = 0$ or $\mathbb{P}[D_d = 22] = 1$ is excluded. Then $\mathbb{Q}[D_d = 22] = 0$ and we set $\mathbb{Q}[D_d = 23] = 1 - \sum_{k=17}^{21} \mathbb{Q}[D_d = k]$. Note that $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{Q}$ for $d \neq 1, 10$, since $\mathbb{P}[D_d \neq 22] = 1$ for $d \neq 1, 10$.

The probability measure $\mathbb{Q}$ and player's cards determine the optimal strategy. For example, given that player's total equals 19, the player is interested in $\mathbb{Q}[D_d = 20] + \mathbb{Q}[D_d = 21]$, since this is the probability that he loses if he stands.

Table 1: Dealer's probabilities using $\mathbb{Q}$ for one deck (dealer stands on soft 17; the numbers are cut after five digits).

$\mathbb{Q}$	17	18	19	20	21	bust
2	0.13897	0.13176	0.13181	0.12394	0.12052	0.35297
3	0.13030	0.13094	0.12376	0.12334	0.11604	0.37559
4	0.13097	0.11416	0.12067	0.11628	0.11509	0.40280
5	0.11968	0.12348	0.11690	0.10469	0.10632	0.42890
6	0.16694	0.10645	0.10719	0.10070	0.09787	0.42082
7	0.37234	0.13858	0.07733	0.07889	0.07298	0.25985
8	0.13085	0.36298	0.12944	0.06828	0.06979	0.23862
9	0.12188	0.10392	0.35739	0.12225	0.06110	0.23344
10	0.12415	0.12248	0.12442	0.35686	0.03956	0.23249
1	0.18378	0.19089	0.18868	0.19169	0.07513	0.16981

Deck and Cards' Probabilities

Now, we want to know how the fact that dealer doesn't have a natural affects cards' probabilities.

At any time the content of a deck is described by ten numbers $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{10})$, where a_1 denotes the number of aces, a_2 the number of deuces, a_3 the number of three's, ..., and a_{10} the number of ten's. We refer to this deck as *deck*. When a card with a face value $k = 1, 2, \ldots, 10$ is drawn from *deck*, then

$$\mathbb{P}[k] = a_k/t, \quad \text{where} \quad t = a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_{10}.$$

Now suppose that dealer's face-up card is a ten or an ace, but he doesn't have a natural. Despite the fact that we use the same deck, the probabilities are different. If $d = 10$, then

$$\mathbb{Q}[1] = \frac{a_1}{t-1}, \quad \mathbb{Q}[k] = \frac{a_k}{t-1}\frac{t-a_1-1}{t-a_1} \quad \text{for} \quad k = 2, \ldots, 10,$$

or if $d = 1$, then

$$\mathbb{Q}[10] = \frac{a_{10}}{t-1}, \quad \mathbb{Q}[k] = \frac{a_k}{t-1}\frac{t-a_{10}-1}{t-a_{10}} \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, \ldots, 9.$$

And as we noted before $\mathbb{P}[k] = \mathbb{Q}[k]$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, 10$ if $d \neq 1, 10$. See the appendix for derivation of these probabilities.

Player's Options

In this section we assume that dealer doesn't have a natural. A player with two cards has three or four options (this depends on casino's rules). We use W^d_{ST} to denote player's win if he stands and dealer's face-up card is d; W^d_{DD}, he double downs; W^d_H, he hits; W^d_S, he splits. Given player's hand p, the optimal strategy is determined by looking at expected win for each of the available options: $\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|p]$, $\mathbb{E}[W^d_{DD}|p]$, $\mathbb{E}[W^d_H|p]$, or $\mathbb{E}[W^d_S|p]$. An option with the highest expected win is optimal.

If a player has a natural, then he wins one and a half of his original bet, and the game is over so we exclude this possibility in the computations below.

Stand

Given a player with total $p \leq 21$ (no naturals); if he stands, then the three possible outcomes are as follows

- if $D_d < p$ or $D_d = 23$, then he wins one dollar;
- if $D_d > p$ and $D_d \neq 23$, then he loses one dollar;
- if $D_d = p$, we have a tie, nothing happens.

So player's expected win equals

$$\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|p, deck] = \mathbb{Q}[D_d < p] + \mathbb{Q}[D_d = 23] - \mathbb{Q}[D_d > p, D_d \neq 23],$$

where $\mathbb{E}[\,\cdot\,|p, deck]$ denotes the expected win under the condition that his total equals p and the cards are coming from *deck*. To simplify the notation we usually skip the conditioning on *deck*, moreover when dealing with expressions of the type $\mathbb{Q}[i]\mathbb{E}[\,\cdot\,|p+i]$, it is understood that the expected value is conditioned on $deck - \{i\}$.

Double Down

Given a player with two cards, doubling down means that he doubles his bet and gets only one additional card. By considering all the possibilities for this extra card, we get

$$\mathbb{E}[W^d_{DD}|p] = 2\sum_{i=1}^{10} \mathbb{Q}[i]\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|p+i].$$

Hit

Given a player with total p, when hitting he gets one card and has an option to stand or take another hit; we can assume that the player doesn't hit 21, since $\mathbb{E}[W^d_H|21] \leq \mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|21]$ in any situation. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[W^d_H|p] = \sum_{i=1}^{10} \mathbb{Q}[i] \begin{cases} \max(\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|p+i], \mathbb{E}[W^d_H|p+i]) & \text{if} \quad p+i < 21; \\ \mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|p+i] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is a finite recursion, since the longest sequence of player's cards has length 20.[1] We can introduce an extra variable that controls the recursion level; 13 is needed to compute $\mathbb{E}[W^d_H|1+1]$, but other hands need lower level of recursion, given desired accuracy, see the implementation.

Split

If a player has two cards with the same value, he can split them into two hands (adding extra bet). Casinos' rules on player's option after a split vary; they differ on number of splits allowed for non-aces and aces, and the ability to double down. Despite that, the following is true for any split

$$\mathbb{E}[W^d_S|p+p] = 2\mathbb{E}[W^d_{\text{play}}|p],$$

where "play" means all the options available to a player after splitting a hand. This formula is true because after split there are two identical hands (they are not independent but this doesn't concern us since expected value of sum equals sum of expected values).

[1] 1+1+1+1+1+1+1+1+1+1+2+1+1+1+1+1+1+1+1+1=21.

When splitting aces each hand gets only one additional card (blackjack's rule), so

$$\mathbb{E}[W^d_{S1}|1+1] = 2\sum_{i=1}^{10} \mathbb{Q}[i]\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|1+i],$$

where $S1$ means only one split. If a casino allows for re-splitting aces then "play" means only one additional card but two aces can be split again, so

$$\mathbb{E}[W^d_S|1+1] = 2\mathbb{Q}[1]\max(\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|1+1], \mathbb{E}[W^d_{S1}|1+1]) + 2\sum_{i=2}^{10} \mathbb{Q}[i]\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|1+i].$$

See the implementation for the general case.

Table 2: The expectations for two decks (dealer stands on soft 17, double down after split is allowed, re-splitting aces and non-ace pairs is allowed; the numbers are cut after six digits).

p	$\mathbb{E}[W^6_{ST}\|p]$	$\mathbb{E}[W^6_H\|p]$	$\mathbb{E}[W^6_{DD}\|p]$	$\mathbb{E}[W^6_S\|p]$	Action
$2+10$	-0.156818	-0.165123	-0.330246		stand
$3+10$	-0.155641	-0.232503	-0.465006		stand
$4+10$	-0.154544	-0.304424	-0.608848		stand
$5+10$	-0.153729	-0.376364	-0.752728		stand
$6+10$	-0.165609	-0.414113	-0.828226		stand
$7+10$	0.001024	-0.496273	-0.992546		stand
$8+10$	0.276027	-0.597068	-1.194140		stand
$9+10$	0.490271	-0.714945	-1.429890		stand
$10+10$	0.700605	-0.849453	-1.698910	0.569494	stand
$1+1$	-0.129268	0.192311	0.213109	0.836235	split
$1+2$	-0.134355	0.164810	0.204564		double
$1+3$	-0.133179	0.142659	0.200079		double
$1+4$	-0.132096	0.118918	0.189631		double
$1+5$	-0.131183	0.107088	0.197579		double
$1+6$	0.012003	0.131284	0.262569		double
$1+7$	0.273910	0.192289	0.384579		double
$1+8$	0.489571	0.240709	0.481418		stand
$1+9$	0.699584	0.284227	0.568454		stand
$1+10$	1.500000	0.337395	0.674791		stand

Optimal Strategy and It's Payoff

Given player's two-card hand with total p, the optimal strategy is given by the action with the highest expectation. For example, if

$$\mathbb{E}[W^d_{DD}|p] = \max(\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|p], \mathbb{E}[W^d_{DD}|p], \mathbb{E}[W^d_H|p], \mathbb{E}[W^d_S|p]),$$

then a player should double down. Or for player's hand with at least three cards, we compare $\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|p]$ to $\mathbb{E}[W^d_H|p]$.

Now, we focus on an arbitrary hand, assuming that player follows the optimal strategy. We want to compute his average win W. Let W_d denote player's win given that dealer's face-up card is d, then $\mathbb{E}[W] = \sum_{d=1}^{10} \mathbb{P}[d]\mathbb{E}[W_d]$. For $d \neq 1, 10$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[W_d] = \sum_{i,j=1}^{10} \mathbb{Q}[i,j]\mathbb{E}[W_d|i+j], \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbb{E}[W_d|i+j] = 1.5 \text{ if } i+j = 21,$$

and $\mathbb{E}[W_d|i+j] = \max(\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|i+j], \mathbb{E}[W^d_H|i+j], \mathbb{E}[W^d_{DD}|i+j], \mathbb{E}[W^d_S|i+j])$ if $i+j < 21$.

There are two special cases, $\mathbb{E}[W_1]$ and $\mathbb{E}[W_{10}]$, where we need to consider the possibility that dealer has a natural. In order to compute $\mathbb{E}[W_1]$ we consider two cases: dealer has a natural and dealer does not have a natural,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[W_1] &= \mathbb{P}[D_1 = 22]\mathbb{E}[W_1|D_1 = 22] + \mathbb{P}[D_1 \neq 22]\mathbb{E}[W_1|D_1 \neq 22] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[10]\mathbb{E}[W_1|D_1 = 22] + (1 - \mathbb{P}[10])\mathbb{E}[W_1|D_1 \neq 22] \\ &= -\mathbb{P}[10](1 - \mathbb{P}[1, 10|\mathit{deck} - \{1, 10\}]) + (1 - \mathbb{P}[10]) \sum_{i,j=1}^{10} \mathbb{Q}[i,j]\mathbb{E}[W_1|i+j].\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbb{P}[1, 10]$ means the probability of a natural. Moreover, we compute $\mathbb{E}[W_{10}]$ using the same method.

Table 3: The expected wins, $\mathbb{E}[W]$, as a percentage of the original bet for different set of rules and different number of decks (the first column). The first row specifies the options used: double down after split, re-split aces, re-split non-ace pairs. For example, 010 means double down after split is not allowed, re-splitting aces is allowed, and re-splitting non-ace pairs is not allowed. The card probabilities are constant for the infinite deck.

$\mathbb{E}[W]$	000	001	010	011	100	101	110	111
1	−.6747	−.6585	−.6508	−.6345	−.5452	−.5174	−.5212	−.4934
2	−.6876	−.6628	−.6438	−.6190	−.5619	−.5215	−.5180	−.4776
3	−.6884	−.6607	−.6369	−.6093	−.5645	−.5202	−.5131	−.4688
4	−.6889	−.6598	−.6335	−.6045	−.5659	−.5197	−.5105	−.4644
5	−.6893	−.6594	−.6315	−.6017	−.5669	−.5196	−.5091	−.4618
6	−.6897	−.6593	−.6303	−.5999	−.5677	−.5197	−.5083	−.4603
7	−.6900	−.6592	−.6294	−.5986	−.5683	−.5197	−.5077	−.4592
8	−.6902	−.6591	−.6288	−.5977	−.5687	−.5198	−.5073	−.4583
∞	−.6901	−.6569	−.6223	−.5891	−.5702	−.5186	−.5025	−.4509

The first thing to notice about Table 3 is that all its numbers are negative. So playing a blackjack is a losing proposition (if you don't vary your bets). But

Table 4: Effect of card removal on expected win in percentages, where the first row gives the number of decks and the first column represents cards to be removed; double down after split is allowed, re-splitting aces and non-ace pairs is allowed.

r_i	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	−.656	−.316	−.208	−.155	−.123	−.102	−.087	−.076
2	.363	.187	.126	.094	.076	.064	.054	.048
3	.427	.216	.144	.109	.088	.073	.063	.055
4	.564	.289	.194	.147	.118	.099	.085	.075
5	.733	.373	.250	.188	.151	.126	.108	.095
6	.415	.209	.140	.106	.085	.071	.062	.054
7	.267	.134	.089	.066	.053	.044	.038	.033
8	−.013	−.010	−.009	−.008	−.007	−.005	−.004	−.004
9	−.181	−.097	−.068	−.051	−.041	−.034	−.029	−.025
10	−.444	−.236	−.162	−.122	−.098	−.082	−.070	−.061

we can do better. In theory, given a *deck*, if $\mathbb{E}[W|deck] > 0$ we bet one dollar; if $\mathbb{E}[W|deck] \leq 0$ we bet zero dollars. This strategy has a positive expected win, although it has to be modified, since computing $\mathbb{E}[W|deck]$ at a blackjack's table would be difficult. The solution: we estimate $\mathbb{E}[W|deck]$ by paying attention to cards removed from a deck.

First, we compute the effect of card removal on expected win, namely, we compute the change in expected value if one card is removed,

$$r_i = \mathbb{E}[W|deck - \{i\}] - \mathbb{E}[W|deck] \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, 10,$$

see Table 4. It implies that the cards 1, 8, 9, and 10 (inside the deck) increase player's expected win, since $r_i < 0$ implies $\mathbb{E}[W|deck] > \mathbb{E}[W|deck - \{i\}]$; the cards 2,3,4,5,6, and 7 decrease player's expected win. So by counting cards from these two groups and weighting them according to Table 4, we can estimate $\mathbb{E}[W]$ and bet accordingly, for more details see Gottlieb [2] or Thorp [3].

Example. Let *deck* be composed of two decks with 111 as our blackjack's rules, see Table 3. So we know that $\mathbb{E}[W|deck] = -.004776$. Now, suppose that the cards $R = \{1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 4, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 7, 7, 8, 10\}$ are removed from the deck. The direct computation shows that $\mathbb{E}[W|deck - R] = 0.018249$, whereas using Table 4 and linear interpolation (an interpolation using an exponential function would be better) when removing more than one card of the same value, we estimate

$$\mathbb{E}[W|deck - R] \approx 0.01965.$$

How fast are these procedures when implemented?

The execution times of the program implementing the procedures described in this paper depends on dealer's face-up card. The table below gives times (in

seconds) needed to compute $\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|p]$ one thousand times for different dealer's face-up cards (player's total is negligible, four decks were used). It was done on a computer with two 1.2 MHz processors (with 256 kB cache each), Although, only one processor was used to run the program.

d	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	1
time	2.24	1.36	0.82	0.49	0.29	0.18	0.11	0.07	0.05	0.73

Moreover, $\mathbb{E}[W^d_{DD}|p]$ computes $\mathbb{E}[W^d_{ST}|\cdot]$ ten times; computational complexity of $\mathbb{E}[W^d_H|p]$ depends on recursion level, for example, it takes 0.51 seconds to compute $\mathbb{E}[W^2_H|10]$ with 9 recursion levels and 0.05 seconds with 2 recursion levels (the outputs are identical up to 15 digits after a decimal point). The most complicated case $\mathbb{E}[W^2_S|2+2]$ took 173.76 seconds to compute and 1.10 seconds for $\mathbb{E}[W^2_S|10+10]$. A faster processor with a bigger cache should compute any split in a matter of seconds. Moreover, it takes about 30 minutes to compute $\mathbb{E}[W]$, although some trivial optimization techniques could cut that in half.

Appendix A: conditional probabilities

Given $d = 10$ and the fact that the dealer doesn't have a natural we want to compute $\mathbb{Q}[k]$ for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, 10$. By definition

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{Q}[k] &= \mathbb{P}[k|\text{dealer's face-down card} \neq \text{ace}] \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}[k \text{ and dealer's face-down card} \neq \text{ace}]}{\mathbb{P}[\text{dealer's face-down card} \neq \text{ace}]}.\end{aligned}$$

We compute $\mathbb{Q}[1]$; first the probability in the denominator,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}[\text{dealer's face-down card} \neq \text{ace}] &= 1 - \mathbb{P}[\text{dealer's face-down card} = \text{ace}] \\ &= 1 - a_1/t.\end{aligned}$$

To compute the probability in the numerator, consider all the permutations of the unknown cards (dealer's face-down card is considered to be in a deck); there are $\frac{t!}{a_1!a_2!\cdots a_{10}!}$ of them. Next consider all the permutation with an ace as the first and a non-ace as the last card (dealer's face-down card). We count them considering nine choices for the last card,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{(t-2)!}{(a_1-1)!(a_2-1)!a_3!\cdots a_{10}!} + \frac{(t-2)!}{(a_1-1)!a_2!(a_3-1)!a_4!\cdots a_{10}!} + \cdots \\ &+ \frac{(t-2)!}{(a_1-1)!a_2!\cdots a_8!(a_9-1)!a_{10}!} + \frac{(t-2)!}{(a_1-1)!a_2!\cdots a_9!(a_{10}-1)!}.\end{aligned}$$

This sum multiplied by $\frac{a_1!a_2!\cdots a_{10}!}{t!}$ simplifies to $\frac{a_1(t-a_1)}{t(t-1)}$, so $\mathbb{Q}[1] = a_1/(t-1)$. The same method works for $\mathbb{Q}[2], \mathbb{Q}[3], \ldots, \mathbb{Q}[10]$.

Appendix B: Implementation

We use the following C++ class to describe a deck of cards,

```
class Deck {
    Deck(...);
    double cardProb(int i);
    double cardProb(int i, int d);
    void   removeCard(int i);
    void   addCard(int i);
    ...
};
```

where $i = 1, 2, \ldots, 10$ and $d = 1, 2, \ldots, 10$. The function `cardProb(i)` gives probabilities according to measure $\mathbb{P}$; the function `cardProb(i,d)` gives probabilities according to measure $\mathbb{Q}$, when dealer's face-up card is d. The other functions are self explanatory. The example below shows how to compute the probability of $\{1+2,\ 2+1\}$ for cards coming from *deck*.

```
double probability = 0.0;
double tmp = deck.cardProb(1);
if(tmp>0.0) {
    deck.removeCard(1);
    proability = 2.0*tmp*deck.cardProb(2);
    deck.addCard(1);
}
return(probability);
```

Also it is convenient to create a class adding cards according to blackjack's rules. The class has an integer (hand's total) and a boolean variable (soft/hard hand) as members.

```
class Hand {
   Hand(...);
   Hand& operator+=(int i);
   bool  operator<=(int i);
   bool  operator==(int i);
   bool  operator<(int i);
   ...
};

Hand operator+(const Hand& h, int i);
```

The non-member operator `operator+(const Hand& h, int i)` is used to create temporary objects passed by value to other functions; given a hand, the operator `operator+=(int i)` is used to add cards to it. For example,

```
Hand h(5); h += 1;
```

creates a soft sixteen.

With these two classes, the implementation of the expected value functions for stand (no naturals), double down, hit, and split is straightforward.

```
double STAND(Hand p, int d, Deck deck) {
    if(p>21) return(-1.0);
    if(p<17) return(Q(23,d,deck)-Q(17,d,deck)-...-Q(21,d,deck));
    else return(1.0-Q(p,d,deck)-2.0*(Q(p+1,d,deck)+...+Q(21,d,deck)));
}
```

where `Q(i,d,deck)` denotes $\mathbb{Q}[D_d = i|deck]$.

```
double DOUBLE(Hand p, int d, Deck deck) {
   double total = 0.0;
   for(int i=1;i<=10;++i) {
      double tmp = deck.cardProb(i,d);
      if(tmp>0.0) {
         deck.removeCard(i);
         total += tmp*STAND(p+i,d,deck);
         deck.addCard(i);
      }
   }
   return(2.0*total);
}
```

A variable `rec` controls the depth of recursion.

```
double HIT(Hand p, int d, Deck deck, int rec=13) {
   double total = 0.0;
   for(int i=1;i<=10;++i) {
      double tmp = deck.cardProb(i,d);
      if(tmp>0.0) {
         deck.removeCard(i);
         if(p+i>=21 || rec<=0) total += tmp*STAND(p+i,d,deck);
         else total += tmp*max(STAND(p+i,d,deck),HIT(p+i,d,deck,--rec));
         deck.addCard(i);
      }
   }
   return(total);
}
```

When splitting we distinguish between a pair of aces and a non-ace pair. With two aces we use a boolean variable rsa (re-split aces).

```
RealNum SPLIT_ACES(int d, Deck deck, bool rsa) {
   Hand ace(1);
   double total = 0.0;
   for(int i=1;i<=10;++i) {
      double tmp = deck.cardProb(i,d);
      if(tmp>0.0) {
         deck.removeCard(i);
         if(rsa && i==1) total += tmp*max(STAND(ace+i,d,deck),
                                          SPLIT_ACES(d,deck,false));
         else total += tmp*STAND(ace+i,d,deck);
         deck.addCard(i);
```

```
      }
   }
   return(2.0*total);
}
```

Given $p > 1$, we use two boolean variables, das (double down after split) and rsp (re-split non-ace pairs), and an auxiliary procedure `NOSPLIT(Hand p, int d, Deck deck, bool das)`. With `rsp=true`, one hand could lead to four hands.

```
double SPLIT(Hand p, int d, Deck deck, bool das, bool rsp) {
   double total = 0.0;
   for(int i=1;i<=10;++i) {
      double  tmp = deck.cardProb(i,d);
      if(tmp>0.0) {
         deck.removeCard(i);
         if(rsp && p==i) total += tmp*max(NOSPLIT(p+i,d,deck,das),
                                          SPLIT(p,d,deck,das,false));
         else total += tmp*NOSPLIT(p+i,d,deck,das);
         deck.addCard(i);
      }
   }
   return(2.0*total);
}

double NOSPLIT(Hand p, int d, Deck deck, bool das) {
   if(p>=21) return(STAND(p,d,deck));
   else
      if(das) return(max(STAND(p,d,deck),DOUBLE(p,d,deck),HIT(p,d,deck)));
      else return(max(STAND(p,d,deck),HIT(p,d,deck)));
}
```

Appendix C: dealer's probabilities

We start with a procedure that computes dealer's probabilities of $17, 18, \ldots, 21$. To be more specific let's focus on $\mathbb{P}[D_d = 18]$; 19, 20, and 21 work the same way, with 17 as an exception.

Computing: $\mathbb{P}[D_d = e]$

We decompose $\{D_c = 18\}$ into disjoint subsets $\{d \to 16+2 = 18\}$, $\{d \to 15+3 = 18\}$, $\{d \to 14+4 = 18\}$, and so on, where the notation $d \to e + k$ means all the possible cards combinations that add up to e starting with total d and exactly one card with face value k. So

$$\mathbb{P}[D_d = 18] = \mathbb{P}[d \to 16 + 2 = 18] + \mathbb{P}[d \to 15 + 3 = 18] + \cdots .$$

Moreover, we notice that we can move backward, namely

$$\mathbb{P}[d \to 16 + 2 = 18] = \mathbb{P}[2]\mathbb{P}[d \to 16 | deck - \{2\}].$$

The implementation looks as follows.

```
double dealerProb21(int d, int e, Deck deck) {
   double total = 0.0;
   if(e==17)  return(dealerProb17(d,17,deck));
   else {
     for(int i=e-16;i<=min(e-d,11);++i) {
        double tmp = deck.cardProb(i);
        if(tmp>0.0) {
           deck.removeCard(i);
           total += tmp*dealerProb17(d,e-i,deck);
           deck.addCard(i);
        }
     }
   }
   return(total);
}
```

Now, a procedure `dealerProb17(d,e)` that computes the probabilities $\mathbb{P}[d \to e]$ for $e \leq 17$ is needed.

Computing: $\mathbb{P}[d \to e$ soft$]$ and $\mathbb{P}[d \to e$ hard$]$

Given $e \leq 17$, we distinguish between soft and hard totals: $\mathbb{P}[d \to e] = \mathbb{P}[d \to e \text{ soft}] + \mathbb{P}[d \to e \text{ hard}]$, or

```
dealerProb17(d,e) = dealerSoft17(d,e) + dealerHard17(d,e);
```

A brute force is used to compute $\mathbb{P}[d \to e \text{ soft}]$; the most complicated case $2 \to 17s$ can be decomposed into five cases: $2+1+(4)$, $2+1+1+(3)$, $2+(2)+1+(2)$, $2+(3)+1+1$, and $2+(4)+1$, where (a) means all the decompositions of a; the procedure `prob(int a)` computes the probability of them.

Next, $\mathbb{P}[d \to e \text{ hard}]$ is computed using a recursive procedure presented below.

```
double dealerHard17(int d, int e, Deck deck) {
   if(e==d) return(1.0);
   if(e-d==1) return(0.0);
   double total = 0.0;
   double tmp = deck.cardProb(1);
   if(tmp>0.0) {
      deck.removeCard(1);
      if(d+11<=16) total += tmp*dealerSoft2Hard17(d+11,e,deck);
      deck.addCard(1);
   }
   for(int i=2;i<=min(e-d,10);++i) {
      double tmp = deck.cardProb(i);
      if(tmp>0.0) {
         deck.removeCard(i);
         if(d+i<11) total += tmp*dealerHard17(d+i,e,deck);
```

```
         else total += tmp*prob(e-d-i,deck);
         deck.addCard(i);
      }
   }
   return(total);
}
```

And we use a brute force to compute `dealerSoft2Hard17(d,e,deck)`, for example, $16s \to 15h$ can be decomposed as $16s+9$, $16s+8+1$, $16s+7+(2)$, and $16s+6+(3)$.

Finally, two auxiliary procedures are needed. The first one, `prob(int a)`, computes the probability of all possible decompositions of a. For example, if $a=4$ then there are eight of them: 4, $1+3$, $3+1$, $2+2$, $1+1+2$, $1+2+1$, $2+1+1$, and $1+1+1+1$. Since we need it only for $a=0,1,2,\ldots,6$, we can list all the cases and compute them one by one.

The second procedure, `prob(int a, int b)`, where $a,b \le 5$, computes the probability of all possible decompositions of a and b. For example, if $a=2$ and $b=3$, then $2+3$, $1+1+3$, $2+1+2$, $2+2+1$, $1+1+1+2$, $1+1+2+1$, $2+1+1+1$, and $1+1+1+1+1$.

```
double prob(int a, int b, Deck deck) {
   if(a==0) return(prob(b,deck));
   if(b==0) return(prob(a,deck));
   double total = 0.0;
   for(int i=1;i<=a;++i) {
      double tmp=deck.cardProb(i);
      if(tmp>0.0) {
         deck.removeCard(i);
         total += tmp*prob(a-i,b,deck);
         deck.addCard(i);
      }
   }
   return(total);
}
```

References

[1] Baldwin, R. R., et al., *The Optimum Strategy in Blackjack,* Journal of the American Statistical Association **51** (1956), 429–439.

[2] Gottlieb, G., *An Analytic Derivation of Blackjack Win Rates,* Operations Research **33** (1985), 971–988.

[3] Thorp, E. O., *Beat the Dealer: A Winning Strategy for the Game of Twenty-One,* Random House, New York 1966.